

# The International Academics are Wrong on BBC Documentary on Rwanda

By [Jaqueline Umurungi](#)

Global Research, November 16, 2014

Region: [sub-Saharan Africa](#)

Theme: [Crimes against Humanity](#), [Media Disinformation](#)

*The international scholars, scientists, researchers, journalists and historians were wrong on Rwanda BBC Documentary and are misinformed or confused on this issue because they claim to know more on Rwanda than Rwandans especially on issues that Rwandans either participated in or saw them happening on their horizon.*

I'm saying this because of the recent condemnation by the above group of the BBC 2 Documentary that exposed the long old theory that Kagame and his supporters have all along been feeding the international community for their own interests to harvest from their lies and keep Kagame in power.

Whereas the documentary is clear from the start to the end where it shows how the interahamwe and their government (MRND) planned genocide, Kagame on the other hand was planning to take power by all means; this is the contentious issue both in law and in fact. Why these so called academics are distorting the facts of the BBC Documentary? There is no illusion on this; Kagame's lobbying machinery against anything that might shake his power is at its peak mobilizing. They are in all the corridors of academics or governments, religious leaders or anything that Kagame could see that will change the page of the correct line of his old lies.

The above academics admit that they accept legitimate investigation to be done, but according to them these investigation should not distort the reality of genocide of 1994.

"We accept and support that it is legitimate to investigate, with due diligence and respect for factual evidence, any crimes committed by the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF), and to reflect on the contemporary political situation in Rwanda. However, attempts to examine these issues should not distort the reality of the 1994 genocide. It is not legitimate to use current events to either negate or to diminish the genocide. Nor is it legitimate to promote genocide denial."

Like their godfather president Kagame, they are in fact using the same language this Rwandan ruler has been using to exterminate his political opponents .He has made laws that will lock up or kill those perceived to oppose his brutal rule using his courts or prisons or just extrajudicial killing. Do these academics have the reality on the facts of Rwanda? Could they be clear on what part the Documentary denies, negates or promote genocide? Is genocide not a crime against humanity and a crime against humanity equivalent to genocide?

The above academics in fact are getting it wrong, because according to Prof. William Schabas a criminal law expert, international crimes, namely genocide, crimes against humanity, ethnic cleansing have the same weight in law. Why should therefore questioning the massacres of Kibeho , Mukarange, Bwisige Karama and other places where RPF was in control be called distorting the reality of genocide?

Unfortunately, far from reality these academics are experts in history and political science, they don't know that in criminal law, if there is new evidence about a crime, it could change the whole precedence of the law. Why shouldn't they ask whether appeals could be made on new evidence? Indeed, for their information that's why many countries have or are campaigning to abolish death penalty. Because if the new evidence is found they can either apply for a re trial of the case but it would be impossible in case the person is dead.

This looks like General Doctor (GP) trying to treat even the disease which needs a specialist. For example in US a woman who was sentenced for 17 years for murder, it was discovered that there was miscarriage of justice during her trial , the judge ordered her release , do these academics propose that this lady would have been left to rot in jail so that they don't distort the earlier ruling of the court?

The judge said that in Mellen's case the justice system failed and she had inadequate representation by her attorney at trial.

"I believe that not only is Ms Mellen not guilty, based on what I have read I believe she is innocent," Arnold said. "For that reason I believe in this case the justice system failed."

This is one example of million cases in US and other countries in Europe and UK, which have been overturned after the judiciary gets new evidence. Yet this fair trial does not happen in Rwanda. Just recently in the case of Gen. Frank Rusagara the Military Court found the General was illegally detained but they did not release him.

Why in UK they are now prosecuting cases that were committed in 1970s? Do these academics appreciate the cases in the ICTR that were overturned moreover the Rwandan RPF government was accusing them of genocide? Gen. Kabiligi, and the former Minister of Commerce Mugenzi Justin, just a few cases in ICTR. These academics seem to misplace their arguments and indeed confine themselves in politics but frankly not in Law.

Furthermore, these academics base their arguments on three pillars in what they call "utmost concern" the first is a lie about the true nature of the Hutu Power militia. The second is an attempt to minimize the number of Tutsi murdered in the genocide, and the third is an effort to place the blame for shooting down President Habyarimana's plane on April 6, 1994 on the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF).

It is unfortunate again that these academics distort the facts of the documentary of the BBC, no at any time did the BBC Documentary underestimate the Hutu Power Militia, in fact what the documentary is saying is that Kagame should have been aware or appreciate that these mad people were trained to kill and would have not have put more fuel on the burning flames.

Again, on whom shot the Habyarimana presidential jet, there are is no more confusion on this, because the people who were there and who have the evidence are coming out and saying here we have receipts that bought the missiles that hit the presidential jet. Why

should these new evidences be called distorting the reality of 1994?

Why should these academics not appreciate that the 1991 census in Rwanda by World Bank put the number of Tutsis below One Million? Is it minimizing the number of Tutsis or rather RPF is increasing the number of the dead Tutsis for the reasons the academics don't ask or deliberately ignore. Have these academics ever asked their doll Kagame the graves of the Hutus who were killed in genocide? Unless these issues are addressed by Rwandans but not those academics from US, UK, EUROPE and CANADA, we are just sweeping our houses and put the rubbish under the carpet.

They refer in their argument on international organizations reports like by Amnesty International, UNICEF, the UN Human Rights Commission, Oxfam, Human Rights Watch, Africa Rights, a UN Security Council mandated Commission of Experts and evidence submitted to the ICTR and other European courts who have successfully put on trial several perpetrators. Assuming this is correct, but if the information that these organizations had before was inaccurate or incorrect and now new information is discovered, why should be it be regarded as distortion?

Do these academics know that Human Rights Watch and Amnesty international are the worst enemies of Kagame today because of continued questions on his criminal record and human rights violations? If they are not convinced they should ask the Director of Human Rights Watch Kenneth Roth or [Carina Tertsakian](#). It's unfortunate that Alison Des Forges died, she would have told you that Kagame is now the only remaining criminal in office of the president in the world.

Why should these academics not ask the Rwandan President to go to The Hague to clear his name in the same way the Kenyan President did? Why should they appreciate the international organizations that praise Kagame and ignore those that criticize him?

Is this the new academic order of pros without contrasts? We have the UN Mapping report or the Report of Experts; both accuse the Rwandan ruler of mass violations of human rights in Congo. These Kagame admirers hardly mention about them? Do these academics know that the Burundian Prosecution under Valentin Bagora unkunda has confirmed that the dead bodies the world witnessed recently in Lake Rweru came from Rwanda?

He is now requesting the international community to help in invitation to establish the identity of these people. Yet the Rwandan government is determined to exhume these dead bodies and relocate them. In fact what these academics are doing is the reason the BBC Documentary discovered, the cover up of the crimes of Kagame, or those white washing a criminal of the 21 century.

We support the BBC and we call upon other independent institutions like CNN or Aljazeera to make further investigations, because even the supporters of Kagame have indicated on a number of occasions that Rwanda is a time Bomb.

Where are the people who have disappeared or reported missing?

“We have been closely observing the situation experienced by human rights activists, members of the opposition and also the Rwandan media for several years,” said Gesinde Ames from the Ecumenical Network for Central Africa, an association of German church organizations. “There are no longer any free

media in Rwanda,” Ames said. “There is a state organ which is under strict control. And it is the same with opposition movements.” Any attempts to counter Kagame by establishing new political parties were quickly stifled, with “party leaders arrested and sentenced to life imprisonment,” Ames told DW

Do these academics know that there is no legal difference between genocide and crimes against humanity? All are international crimes and should call international attention and intervention. As much as we condemn in the strongest times possible those who use any interpretation to deny genocide, we don't also support those who use genocide to commit other crimes against humanity; TWO WRONGS don't MAKE A RIGHT? Kagame should be brought to justice and accountable for all the crimes he has committed.

The original source of this article is Global Research  
Copyright © [Jaqueline Umurungi](#), Global Research, 2014

---

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Jaqueline Umurungi](#)

**Disclaimer:** The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)  
[www.globalresearch.ca](http://www.globalresearch.ca) contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)